SUPREME COURT, U. S.

FILED
OCT 14 1970
ROBERT SEAVER, CLERK

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

Nos. 669, 680, 681, 682, 683,
684, 685, 691 and 692

MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTOR GROUP, ET AL., *Petitioners,*

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, ET AL., *Respondents.*

On Petitions for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

---

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION FOR RESPONDENT, PIPELINE PURCHASER GROUP

(Southern Natural Gas Company, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Trunkline Gas Company, United Fuel Gas Company, United Gas Pipe Line Company)

RAYMOND N. SHIBLEY
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
Attorney for Respondent,
Pipeline Purchaser Group

October 14, 1970

PRESS OF BYRON S. ADAMS PRINTING, INC., WASHINGTON, D. C.

IN THE

Supreme Court of the United States

OCTOBER TERM, 1970

Nos. 669, 680, 681, 682, 683,
684, 685, 691 and 692

MUNICIPAL DISTRIBUTOR GROUP, ET AL., *Petitioners,*

v.

FEDERAL POWER COMMISSION, ET AL., *Respondents.*

On Petitions for Writ of Certiorari to the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit

---

BRIEF IN OPPOSITION FOR RESPONDENT PIPELINE PURCHASER GROUP

Respondent Pipeline Purchaser Group[1] opposes the petitions for writ of certiorari in the above-captioned nine causes, all of which relate to the judgment of

[1] The Pipeline Purchaser Group sought judicial review below but is solely a respondent here. The group consists of eight interstate pipeline purchasers, Southern Natural Gas Company, Tennessee Gas Pipeline Company, Texas Gas Transmission Corporation, Texas Eastern Transmission Corporation, Transcontinental Gas Pipe Line Corporation, Trunkline Gas Company, United Fuel Gas Company, and United Gas Pipe Line Company.

the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit entered on March 19, 1970, because under present circumstances the petitions are premature.

OPINIONS BELOW

The opinion of the Court of Appeals dated March 19, 1970, and its opinion on petitions for rehearing dated June 16, 1970, are not yet reported but have been printed as appendices to Continental Oil Company's petition in No. 680, Appendix A, pages 1-70 and Appendix B, pages 1-3, respectively. The opinions and orders of the Federal Power Commission are reported at 40 FPC 530, and 41 FPC 301, respectively.

JURISDICTION

Petitioners have sought to invoke the jurisdiction of this Court under 28 U.S.C. 1254(1) and Section 19(b) of the Natural Gas Act, 15 U.S.C. 717r(b).

QUESTION PRESENTED

In light of the opinions and judgment below, and the active status of related proceedings being heard by the Federal Power Commission ("Commission") in Docket Nos. AR 69-1, *et al.*, the Pipeline Purchaser Group believes all petitions for writs of certiorari in this case to be premature. Therefore, in our view the question actually presented is:

> Whether it is premature for this Court to review at this time procedural and substantive matters raised by petitioners, since the court below preserved to the Commission the responsibility for determining, in the first instance, the manner in which the recently recognized shortage of natural gas should be treated in prescribing producer rates—an undertaking the Commission is vigorously pursuing in proceedings which have not yet been concluded.

STATEMENT OF THE CASE

Although the petitions adequately describe the general history of the case, they do not focus sharply upon the problem with which the court below, and even more directly the Commission, was confronted.

This proceeding, the second initiated by the Commission under its program to regulate the rates of independent producers of natural gas through area ratemaking, commenced in May, 1961. At that time, and throughout the evidentiary stages of this proceeding, natural gas supplies from the Southern Louisiana area were adequate to meet consumer requirements, although the margin of safety was progressively narrowing.

By the time the Commission issued its decision, Opinion No. 546, on September 25, 1968, the shortage had reached the point at which interstate pipeline purchasers were unable to purchase currently the supplies of gas needed to meet their growing market requirements. Accordingly, when Opinion No. 546 was issued, the Pipeline Purchaser Group filed with the Commission a motion requesting the opportunity to bring to its attention tangible facts as to the gas supply problem, certain in the knowledge that the situation would deteriorate sharply unless the Commission took remedial steps through modification of the recently issued rate order. (R. 398858). Other parties made similar requests.

Although the Commission did not then apprehend the extent to which the gas supply shortage had overtaken the industry, and so did not reopen the proceeding for evidence as to this critical problem, it sought to resolve the issue by initiating another area rate

proceeding for Southern Louisiana, on the same day it denied rehearing in the instant proceeding. The new area rate proceeding, Docket No. AR 69-1, has been moving forward on an accelerated basis throughout the period the instant matter has been under judicial review.

Also, the Commission did not make effective the rate levels provided in its order in the instant proceeding, nor require the payment of refunds based upon such rate levels. In part, this is the result of stay orders issued by the Commission and the court below, and in part it is attributable to the fact that the Commission has not deemed it timely to order such actions.

As the hearings in the new area rate proceeding were commencing, the Commission enlarged the subject matter, initially relating only to offshore regions of the Southern Louisiana area, so as to embrace the onshore regions as well. Thus, the Docket No. AR 69-1 proceeding applies to the entire Southern Louisiana area, and to all vintages of gas, as well as to the appropriate price level for future discoveries.

The Pipeline Purchaser Group, while actively participating in the Docket No. AR 69-1 proceedings, also petitioned for judicial review in the United States Court of Appeals for the Fifth Circuit, urging that the Commission be directed to relate its Southern Louisiana rate order to the eliciting of adequate gas supplies for consumer needs, in light of current conditions.

Without detailing the steps leading to the judgment of the Court of Appeals, it is sufficient for present purposes to note that the Commission ulti-

mately requested a remand, and the court below undertook to assure petitioners and other parties that the Commission would be free to take such action as it deemed necessary to counteract the gas supply shortage. The Commission is currently attempting to do so with active cooperation of almost all the parties, including those involved in this litigation.

As recognized by the court below, the members of the Pipeline Purchaser Group appear in the instant matter solely in their role of purchasers and transporters of Southern Louisiana gas, and their alignment results from the fact that "they are concerned that the price level will not elicit sufficient supply for their needs." (Continental Appendix A, page 2). This is true with respect to this Brief in Opposition as well.

We urge the Court to permit the Commission to proceed as rapidly as possible to resolve the entire pricing problem for the Southern Louisiana area so as to ameliorate what has become a critical gas shortage of nation-wide proportions. This objective can be attained most directly and expeditiously through denial of the petitions for writs of certiorari as prematurely brought.

ARGUMENT

I.

In Its Present Posture, Supreme Court Review of the Judgment Below Would Be Premature

The petitions for writs of certiorari variously seek to question (1) the ratemaking formulae applied by the Commission, some contending that the resultant rates were too low (Nos. 680, 681, 683, 684, 685), and another petitioner contending that they were too high (No. 692); or (2) the procedure employed by the court

below for the purpose of enabling the Commission to implement its rate order if it saw fit while preserving the Commission's authority to modify the order if needed (Nos. 669, 691). Petitioner in No. 692 seeks further review as to both aspects. Finally, the major producer group, Texaco, *et al.*, has conditionally cross-petitioned in No. 681, recognizing prematurity but seeking the right to raise substantive issues in the event certiorari should be granted as to other petitions.

In our view, because of the particular circumstances involved, this case in its present posture presents no issue which is ripe for review. Until the Commission takes further action, which would of necessity be subject to appellate review, no party can be finally affected by the judgment below. And, until the Commission acts, no party can foretell which issues, if any, will ultimately be relevant.

Thus, although it is understandable that parties wish to protect their future positions, or even to obtain judicial sanction for those positions, neither of these objectives calls for affirmative action by the Court at this time.

What is required, we submit, is that the Commission be permitted to take such action as *it* finds to be appropriate in meeting the natural gas shortage in this all-important producing region, and to do so as soon as physically possible. This is so clearly required—and so patently an administrative function—that judicial intervention at this point is neither necessary nor appropriate. It will be time enough to review the court's procedural determination as well as the Commission's substantive ratemaking formulae when an administrative order has been entered dealing comprehensively with all these matters.

As noted above, the Commission instituted a new area rate proceeding in Docket No. AR 69-1 on March 20, 1969, the same day that it denied rehearing in the instant cause. Although initially limited to more recent vintages of gas from the offshore region of Southern Louisiana, the scope of the proceeding was enlarged on December 15, 1969, to embrace *all* vintages of gas from *all* regions of Southern Louisiana.

That proceeding, which none of the petitioners has sought to abort, is presently in a very advanced evidentiary hearing stage and settlement negotiations are progressing concurrently. Since one of the principal objectives of the proceeding is to come to grips with the economic aspects of the current gas shortage, there is every reason to allow that proceeding to be concluded, and no substantial reason to destroy it through piecemeal review of various portions of its subject matter.

The petitions in Nos. 669, 691 and 692 set forth various allegations regarding the impact of the judgment below as to potential refunds, but the facts are that the Commission has never entered an order requiring the payment of refunds in this proceeding. Nor does the court's action in any way preclude ultimate refunds. Contrary to the views expressed in those petitions, the principal issue below related to the rate levels which should have been prescribed—but both the Commission and the Court of Appeals have been at pains to maintain maximum flexibility for the ultimate determination of those rate levels by the Commission.

Since there is no reason to believe that the Commission will shirk its responsibility, and on the con-

trary, there is every indication that it is seeking to arrive at a fair and efficacious solution to a very complex problem, it clearly should not now be hampered or foreclosed.

Finally, with regard to the procedural matters, it is not at all clear that the court's reference to the Commission's freedom to make "retrospective as well as prospective adjustments in this case" would sanction "reparations" or "retroactive ratemaking" as some petitioners suggest. In the first place, as explained above, the Commission's original rate order was never implemented, so this is not an instance of rates having been made effective and later changed, *nunc pro tunc*. Moreover, since the Commission has not taken definitive action in this regard, there is no basis for contending that it has acted unlawfully.

If, in fact, the consequence of the judgment below, or the Commission's action in pending proceedings, were to result in "reparations" or "retroactive ratemaking", the Pipeline Purchaser Group would urge that certiorari be granted and the decision of the court below summarily reversed with directions to remand to the Commission for full reconsideration in light of the critical gas shortage. But, in our opinion, nothing of this nature has occurred.

Thus, both as to the substantive aspects and the procedural questions, the petitions for writs of certiorari present no issue which must, or should be, resolved at this time. The entire subject matter should remain, or be placed, in the hands of the Commission for a definitive determination at the earliest possible time.

CONCLUSION

Wherefore, for the foregoing reasons, the Pipeline Purchaser Group requests that all petitioners for writs of certiorari in these proceedings be denied.

Respectfully submitted,

RAYMOND N. SHIBLEY
1120 Connecticut Avenue, N.W.
Washington, D. C. 20036
Attorney for Respondent,
Pipeline Purchaser Group.

October 14, 1970